

Appl. No. 10/750,018

REMARKS

The above Amendments and the following Remarks are in response to the Office action mailed December 7th, 2006. Claims 1 and 7 have been amended. Claims 1-3 and 5-9 are pending in the application. Applicant appreciates Examiner's careful consideration of the present application.

Response to Arguments

With respect to the present Office action mailed 12/7/2006, applicant contends that the Examiner has not provided a response to arguments contained in the previous Amendment filed Sep. 14, 2006, as required by MPEP 707.07(f). The present rejections under s.102 and s.103 do not indicate whether Examiner took note of applicant's arguments, and do not indicate the reasons why such arguments were not persuasive if Examiner took note of the arguments and considered the arguments to be unpersuasive. In these circumstances, applicant responds to the present rejections as given, and requests that the finality of the present Office action be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

On page 2 of the current Office action, it is stated that new matter was found in claims 1 and 7. The recitation of "and a user defined patent classification" does not comply with the disclosure of "or a user defined patent classification" in paragraph [0038] [sic] of the specification as originally filed.

For the purpose of overcoming these rejections, applicant has amended claim 1 by changing the recitation of "and a user defined patent classification" to the recitation of "or a user defined patent classification", and deleting the recitation of "any one or more of". In addition, applicant has amended claim 7 by changing the recitation of "and a user defined patent classification" to the recitation of "or a user defined patent

Appl. No. 10/750,018

classification", and deleting the recitation of "any one or more of". Based on these amendments, applicant asserts that the recitation of "the patent classification being the international patent classification, the United States of America patent classification, or a user defined patent classification" in both claims 1 and 7 fully complies with the written description requirement. Accordingly, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2, 7 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Zinda (US Pub. No. 2004/0015481), hereinafter referred to as Zinda.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 3-6, 8 and 10 were stated to be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zinda in view of Lee, US Pub. No. 2005/0119995 (hereinafter referred to as Lee).

Claims 1 and 7, as currently amended, include the subject matter of previously canceled claims 4 and 10 respectively. Applicant interprets the stated rejections of claims 4 and 10 (on p.4 of the current Office action) as reasons applicable to rejections of claims 1 and 7 respectively.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and removal of the rejections and allowance of the pending claims. The following remarks herein are responsive to the rejections as understood.

Claims 1-3 and 5-6

Claim 1, as amended, recites in part:

"a parameter obtaining module for obtaining data input by a user, the data comprising downloading parameters and data on a patent classification, the patent classification being the international patent classification, the United

Appl. No. 10/750,018

States of America patent classification, or a user defined patent classification."

As indicated on page 4 of the current Office action, Zinda fails to disclose or teach data on a patent classification mode, a time mode, and a time range as originally recited in claim 3. Applicant has amended claim 1 by incorporating the substance of the patent classification mode limitation of claim 3 therein. Therefore amended claim 1 is novel under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Zinda.

On page 4 of the current Office action, it is stated that Lee teaches the patent classification being the international patent classification, the United States of America patent classification, or a user defined patent classification (para. [0019]). Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses as follows. Lee discloses in para. [0019] that a search engine 304 performs searches based on input data such as: identification numbers (e.g., patent numbers); keywords; text or graphics in select fields (e.g., different segments or information fields of documents such as Publication Number, Publication Date, Title, Inventor, Assignee, Application Number, Filing Date, Related Data, Priority Data, International Classification, U.S. Classification, Cross-Reference Classification, Field of Search, References Cited, Forward References Citing Document, Examiner, Agent, Abstract, Background, Field of Invention, Summary, Brief Description of Drawings, Detailed Description, Claims, Drawings, etc.); Boolean logic characters; or other search criteria (e.g., date restrictions, etc.). However, Lee does not provide any teaching or suggestion of the claimed "patent classification" comprising *a user defined patent classification*. Accordingly, Lee does not disclose, teach, or suggest the limitation of "a parameter obtaining module for obtaining data input by a user, the data comprising downloading parameters and data on a patent classification, the patent classification being the international patent classification, the United States of America patent classification, or *a user defined patent classification*", as set forth in amended claim 1 of the present application.

Appl. No. 10/750,018

Thus, applicant submits that the combination of Zinda and Lee fails to disclose, teach, or otherwise suggest the above-highlighted limitations as currently set forth in claim 1 as amended.

In addition, claim 1 as amended recites in part:

**"a variable defining module for *defining variables of a structured information report* in accordance with the data obtained by the parameter obtaining module; [and]
a column generating module for *generating columns/rows of the structured information report in accordance with the variables of the structured information report.*"**

Applicant submits that Zinda does not disclose, teach, or otherwise suggest the invention having the above-highlighted limitations as set forth in amended claim 1.

Zinda discloses that a matrix approach is coupled with analytics and a spreadsheet like graphical reporting of results retrieved from sets of cross tabulated queries, and also discloses that rows and columns in the matrix are developed in light of a technology landscape (para. [0015]). According to Zinda, the rows and columns of the matrix are developed according to a technology landscape instead of variables. That is, Zinda does not provide any teaching or suggestion of any variables of the matrix. Therefore, Zinda fails to disclose or suggest the limitation of **"a variable defining module for *defining variables of a structured information report* in accordance with the data obtained by the parameter obtaining module, and a column generating module for *generating columns/rows of the structured information report in accordance with the variables of the structured information report,*"** as recited in claim 1 of the present application. Applicant submits that the structured information report recited in amended claim 1 of the present application is patentably distinct from the matrix and the spreadsheet disclosed by Zinda.

Applicant asserts that Lee does not teach or suggest the above-highlighted features

Appl. No. 10/750,018

either. Furthermore, applicant submits that the combination of Zinda and Lee does not teach or suggest the above-highlighted features either.

In conclusion, neither Zinda nor Lee provides any teaching, suggestion, or motivation that it could be combined with the other to yield the inventive system as currently set forth in claim 1, as amended. That is, amended claim 1 is not only novel under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Zinda, but also unobvious and patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Zinda in view of Lee. Applicant requests reconsideration and removal of the rejection and allowance of the claim.

Claims 2-3 and 5-6 depend directly or indirectly from independent amended claim 1, and respectively recite additional subject matter. Therefore, claims 2-3 and 5-6 should also be allowable.

Claims 7-9

Claim 7, as amended, recites in part:

"obtaining attribute data on analyzing the data stored in the local database server, the attribute data comprising a classification mode, the classification mode comprising the international patent classification, the United States of America patent classification, or *a user defined patent classification*;
defining variables of a structured information report in accordance with the attribute data; [and]
generating columns/rows of the structured information report in accordance with the defined variables."

For at least reasons similar and corresponding to those asserted above in relation to amended claim 1, applicant submits that neither Zinda nor Lee, taken alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or otherwise suggests the invention having the above-described limitation, as currently set forth in amended claim 7.

That is, amended claim 7 is not only novel under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Zinda, but also unobvious and patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Zinda in view of Lee.

Appl. No. 10/750,018

Applicant requests reconsideration and removal of the rejection and allowance of the claim.

Claims 8-9 depend directly from independent claim 7, and respectively recite additional subject matter. Therefore, claims 8-9 should also be allowable.

In view of the above claim amendments and remarks, the subject application is believed to be in a condition for allowance, and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Lee et al.

By 

Wei-Chang

Registration No.: 43,325

Please recognize the application with Customer No. 25,859

Foxconn International, Inc.

P.O. Address: 1660 Memorex Drive, Santa Clara, CA 95050

Tel. No.: (408) 919-6137